G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1905.
(Madras)

File No. 56

Serial Nos. 1–32

Papers Filed.

Month July 1907.

SUBJECT.

States that no orders of Government are called for at this stage and directs Commissioner to take action under para 2 the Govt. Pro. No. 3452 Rt. 26-3-05, about certain lands endowed to the Sri Kylaseswara Swami temple Hosamalli in Tipatur

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

Subject
In re levy of Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the Kandayam due on one of the lands belonging to the Sri Kailaseswaraswami temple at Honnavalli, Tiptur Taluk
LAST REFERENCE —

Docket ~~Letter~~ No. 134 dated 6th June 1904. from the Superintendent of Inam Settlements —

During the Inam Settlement in 1870, the marginally noted Lands ~~were~~ were confirmed as Devadaya inam to the Sri Kalle Devaru temple in Honnavalli of the Tiptur Taluk.

In Dec 1899, one Hiriyappaiya Pensioned Head Gumasta residing at Honnavalli, petitioned this Office praying for the appointment of Dharmadarsi to the temple and in July 1900 he again stating that the Dharmadarsi

K. H. P. Old assessment 2-2-11 } Sodi kayada Rs 3-0-0.
Otra wet 1-30-8 6-13-3 } in Honnavalli Hobli —
A. S. 5-20-0 6-0-0 }
Now A 223 pt 5-20 - 7-0-0
Garden 326 2-14-

Old

was trying to alienate the inam lands attached to the temple. These two petns were forwarded to the Dy Comm^r for disposal. The matter was enquired into and an order No 335 of 26th March 1902 was issued by him directing that the garden land was in the enjoyment of Lakshmi Narainappa's ancestors & that they were paying Rs 1-12-9 to the temple. During the Sur:- Settlement this land was assessed at Rs 5 Lakshminarainappa contended that he would pay no more than the assessment. The Dy Comm^r directed that in addition to the Sur:- assessment he should pay the usual rent viz Rs 1-12-9 to the temple. Lakshminarainappa appealed to Govt against the foregoing order

order A report having been
called for, the D Commr has subtd
a detailed report in his letter No
102 of 18th August 1903 This letter
clearly explains the facts of the case
Two persons are recommended to be
appointed Dharmadarsis Lakshminarayana
is reported to have agreed to pay up Rs 60
once for all in lieu of the annual
payment of Rs 1-12-9 & the temple
in view to have undisturbed possession
of the garden land

Submitted for orders

Rs
20/7/04

* The same question was before
Govt once before.
Please obtain and put up
the papers — Ill 24/7/04

Flag A

Ki.-

Kuzhuru Secretary's remarks:-

There are two suits
disposing the temple inam
lands, viz, Sunka da Kanama
and the appellant Lakshminarayappa.

G.R.S. 12]

Secretariat.

File No of 190

Serial No.

The former is reported to have been in the enjoyment of [illegible] of the lands, in connection with getting the watering done [illegible] He appears to have purchased the [illegible] from one Chajahla, Sirdar of Shankaranarayan [illegible] the Nagappa had no right to the lands belonging to the [illegible] and as the case [illegible] 1886, the lands were [illegible] to be restored to the [illegible] agreed to by Ramsay, [illegible] Commissioner, Mysore, [illegible] to lease out the [illegible] to individual, if [illegible] are offered by him [illegible] [illegible] enjoyed by [illegible] he seems to have been [illegible] for many years [illegible]

Shimoga Kadur 5/11

G.R.S.-12]

Mechanic

~~General and Revenue~~ Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

the year 18[illegible] Sc for [illegible] of the
to the temple. He is about to or has
to pay to the temple, [illegible]
addition to the [illegible]
of Rs 5/- which has been levied
imposed upon the land M.
objection cannot be made
as the [illegible] amount must be
paid to Government or recd
be ~~exceeded~~ exceeded. The [illegible]
cannot at the same time [illegible]
the amount due to it [illegible]
The Deputy Commissioner [illegible]
in this respect may therefore
upheld and the [illegible]

In the matter of [illegible]
appellant's [illegible]
lands may be [illegible]
undisturbed, [illegible]
from him a lease [illegible]
in lieu of the [illegible]

Why was this Court fully assessed by M. no samples?

Yes.

In which name does the Khata stand?

NOTE—Contn. sheet

MGGPB-10 000—19 5 01

7

G.R.S. 12]

~~General and Revenue~~ Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Serial No.

B

Chamadarcha

Chamadarcha
29/9/04.

Submitted to the Dewan through the 2nd Cr.

98
29.9.04. Phamacha may remarks with the manager

PTO

MGCPB 10 000—19 5 01

Note contd:-

As the information as per II Councillor's queries was not forthcoming in this Office, enquiries were made of the Dy Comm^r, who now reports that it is Sur: no 340 in the holding of the appellant on which the temple stands, that I has been further assessed and not Sur: no 223.

Dkt no 350 17th Nov. 1904

Submitted with a draft-
30/11/04
Issue the draft
4/12/04
5/12/04

Note continued:-

As the information furnished by the Dy Comm^r in his Docket no 350 ref^d to on the top of this page, was no answer to the query of the II Councillor endorsed on page 6 of this note, enquiry was again made of the Dy Comm^r, who now reports that prior to the introduction of Sur: & Lett^s, the land was not a separate Sur: but that it was a vacant strip of land within the temple premises which had been converted into a flower garden. This vacant strip was it appears obtained by one Narasinga Rao in 1854-55 on condition of his improving it, An assessment of 0-14-0 was being paid for the benefit of the Temple but when in 1865 complaints were made to the unlawful enjoyment, enquiries were made & as at the time Cocoanut trees had come to be re-

no 604 18.2.05 Paper under disposal.

the assessment was raised to Rs 1-12 9 Hence, it is reported, that this strip of land was not shown in the Jain Swamis Accounts & omitted from the Operations of the Settlement. During Survey the land which was in the enjoyment of the petitioners' ancestors was constituted into a separate number (240) & assessed at Rs 5 in 1880-81. The pet.rs having protested against the increased assessment it was enquired into & decided that the land although fully assessed, was still temple property and the occupant was directed to either pay to the temple Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the assessment or to quit the land. At first this order was not heeded but latterly, the pet.rs promised to pay a lump sum of Rs 60 in lieu of the interest thereon viz Rs 1-12-9 being paid to the temple. Even this he is stated to have failed to do.

The Khata which was till 1893-94 in the name of Narasinga Rao, is stated to have since been transferred to Lakshminarasappa - the pet.rs.

Submitted to the 2nd Counsellor with respect to his remarks on page 7 of this Book.

24-2-05 RS
1/3/05

Ramanja Sama Rao
Camp Sivaganga. 3/3/05

Read
6-3-05.

There is no doubt that the land belongs to the temple and the petitioners are paying Rs 1-12-9 to the temple from the

introduction of the Survey Settlement which involves a Recurring annual Loss to Govt. of Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the assessment system is no alternative but to withdraw from the proceedings and Resident to attend on the Commissioner more advantageously & Secure.

D Mackenzie
7/3/05

7/3/05
5281/ Accounts
10 III 05

5215/8.3.05.

Recd 13/3/05 Draft accepted
12/3/05

Issue the drafts but withhold
23/3/05

P.T.O.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued :—

The Dewan's orders recorded on page 10 of this note were issued in Govt Pro: No 3542 of 26th March 1905, a printed copy of which is put up in the file. Flag H.)

Lakshmi Narasappa, son Venkatadasappa, has memorialised H.H. the Maharaja on the subject of the levy from him of the additional amount of Rs 1-12-9 on the temple land in question. His memorial has been referred for disposal. The grounds of appeal are those which were duly considered by Govt and final orders were passed. × Flag G

Submitted with a draft Endorsement.

7.8.05 | 8/8/05

The whole question was fully enquired into and final orders passed in Govt Pro No. 3542 d. 26th March 1905. The Petnr has urged nothing new.

It may be added that the

Flag H.

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Petrus father, who was formerly the Appellant ~~Petrus~~ actually promised to pay a lump sum of Rs: 60/- in lieu of the annual payment of Rs. 1-12-9, but such commutation was refused by Govt.

The present Petn may, I think, be rejected.

Subd to the Dewan through the 2nd Jr

V Ananta Rama Rao
9/8/05

Read
10-8-05

Urgent
The memorial having
reported.

8/8/05

12/8/05 8141/16-8-05 certainly
Read
12/8/05

18.VIII.05

8185

Issue the Endorsement on the File

12/8/05

17

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No of 190

Note contd

no 1094 Dy 28th August 05 An endorsement in terms of the Dewan's order recorded on the previous page, was issued and a copy thereof was forwarded for the information of the Dy Commr

Venkatadasappa of Tiptur has again memorialised H. H the Maharaja praying for a reconsideration of the order putting forward no fresh grounds for the same

no 2465/799 Dy 28th Nov 1905 The memorial has been referred, for disposal, by the Private Secretary to H H the Maharaja Submtd with a draft rejecting the memorial.

RS 10/12/05 A prayer addressed to His Highness was rejected by order of the Dewan and the Councillor.

Reject the prayer - Issue the Endt put up

10/12/05

Camp Chikmaglur

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note contd :—

The Dy Comm^r reports that Lakshmi Narayanappa has given him a notice, (which is subd in original) intimating his intention to file a suit-case in the Civil Court, under Sec : 424 of the Civil Pro: Code. The matter appears to have been delayed in the D^t office x ~~that~~ no intimation however has yet been received by the D/Comm^r ~~advised~~ of the intended suit.

(Hiriyur Note Dy 17-1-07)

May the entire records be sent to the Govt advocate and his opinion asked in the matter?

Submitted
by 25/1/07

Yes
28/1/07

Yes
30/1/07

Muz 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Note continued :—

The enquiry ordered on page 14 of this Note was made of the Govt. Advocate who wanted the deposition of Lakshminarayya and the circumstances under which the payment of the amount of Rs. as. p. 1-12-9 to the temple, ceased be made that Officer to form his opinion in the matter.

Information was thereupon called for from the Dy. Commr. that Officer reports that it is not now ascertainable as to when the payment ceased that Lakshminarayya himself admitted that his ancestors were paying it to the temple

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

that liability be commuted into a lump sum payment of Rs 60 once for all.

The Dy Commr reports that Lakshminarayana died on the 16th December 1906

Submitted may the file be sent to the Govt Advocate with reference to his letter?

16/5/07

16/5/07

16/5/07

Draft submitted 17-5-07

Note contd.—

In respect to the enquiries made as ordered above, the Govt Advocate has given his opinion in his letter no 214 dy 27th May 1907.

(1) He doubts whether the land

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat.

File No. of 190

is a devadasa based on a
if it be one, he says that it
it can be dealt with under
the Inam Rules & that no
Civil Court will have jurisdiction
(In this connection it is
respectfully drawn to the
that the land is Devadaya
as appears from the Inam Extract)

(2) If the land is assessed, he
states that it appears to have been
in enjoyment of Kaderkuninavaru's
who was paying Rs 1-12-9 as per
the Survey Settlement about
years ago — when the
& his own were many
number & that of
discontinued &
temple, & that the

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

[illegible] to the [illegible]
[illegible]. If Lakshmiranappa
[illegible] are still willing to pay
a [illegible] of Rs 60, the Govt
may have no objection that the amount
[illegible] as suggested

Since Lakshminarayanappa is presumed to have died, it is not clear whether the Dy Comr expects any orders from Govt on the subject of the suit intended to be filed by the deceased — He may be asked to report on the point. He may at the same time be requested to take action in pursuance of ~~this~~ G Para 2 of the Govt Lr

Yes
29/6/04

Muz 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

No. Inm 261 dated 1905

We need not say anything on this point for the present But make the Enquiry ordered on the preceding page — HH 24/6/07

24/6/07

Note continued.

The enquiry ordered above was made of the Deputy Commissioner and in reply, he states that it is not known whether the heirs of the deceased Dasappa and Nanjappa mean to press their claim. Submitted with a draft.

Issue the draft as corrected HH 4/7

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

No. 616 Ex. 1.

Ref

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No

dated 7th Dec' 99 received at the

Dewan's Office from Thimmappayya

Pusimani Head Gumasta

residing at Hunsenalli in

Typtur Taluk, Kadaba

requesting that Dharmadarsi

may be appointed to Superin-

tend the affairs of the Kylaseswara

Temple at Hunsenalli

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~

enclosures, to the Dy Commr

Tumkur for disposal.

By Order

BANGALORE,

14/12/1899.

Majr S C

Mur. 3]

ನಂ. 37/8/18.12.99.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಕಛೇರಿ

ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ.

ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸಾಗರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಗೌಮಾರಿನ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನಾಯಕನ ಕೋಟೆಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಚೌಡೇಶ್ವರಿ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ.

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಮಾಹೆ 7 ನೇ ಮುಕ್ತಂ 841 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಆಜ್ಞೆ ~~ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿಸಲು~~ ಅರುಸ್ಸನ್ನವಪಿಳ್ಳೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕುಟ್ಟಿತಿಕ್ಕರವರ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಹಾಜರಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಾಗಿದೆ.

15-12-99 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

B. G.

Sd/ A. Sreenivasa Murthy

Asst Secretary

Refuses
4.8.00

RECEIVED
Date
NO.
SUZNAI BRANCH

No 362 dt 12-9-1900

Encl

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 295 dated 30th July 1900 received at the Dewan's Office from Thimmappayya ~~Pensioned Head Gumasta~~, residing at Hammalli in Tiptur Taluk, stating that one Lakshminarayanappa, Registration Gumasta of Chikkanaikanahalli Taluk is trying to alienate by Sale the Inam Lands attached to the Kyloseswara temple at Hammalli is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the Dy Commr, Tumkur District, in ~~continuation of his~~ Office memo no 616 dated ~~14th~~ December 1899

By Order,

BANGALORE.
10/9/1900

Muzrai Secretary

Reference

1932 of 1902 Dy Regr Hsr

14-3-03

Submitted with reference to this previous appeal petition. Petr. has now explained the cause of delay in appealing.

14-3-03

I think the order was passed by the Dy Commr as Mr Narayana Iyer is on Mr Narayana Iyer's file

16/3/03

1902-03 915

No. 2262

Name of Petitioner Bagepalle Lakshminarayappa

Village residing at

Taluk Kolar

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 6.3.03

Date of Receipt 9.3.03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure two and the previous appeal petn.

ABSTRACT

With reference to this office endt No 1932 dated 3.3.03, asking him to explain the delay in appealing - submits that the order of the Dy Commr (dated 26.3.02) was conveyed to the petr by the Dy Shirastadar only on 12.5.02, that on the petr subsequently applying to the Dy Commr on 13.5.02, vide endt No 9, dated 10.11.02 [illegible] to the petr on 15.[illegible] the Dy Shirastadar, [illegible]

OFFICE OF THE [illegible]
Rec'd [illegible]
Date 18-3-03
1522

Court declined to interfere
with the order of the previous
day Court; that he was
applied for a copy of the
day Court's. But the next
day, that is on 19.11.03,
and the copy was delivered
to petr only on 31.12.03 when
that his appeal to Supt
was filed on 2.2.04

Petr's
that is incorrect

Received
9-3-03

Examined, Compared & Entered
Issued

18-3-03
1522

2268/B
9-3-03

ಮಲ್ಲೇಶಂ ಅವರ ಕಂಪನಿಯವರ ಶ್ರೀ ಅಲ್ಲಿಪಿಡಿ ವೆಂಕಟ್ಟಪ್ಪ
ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ಸಹೋದರರ ಶ್ರೀ ಅಲ್ಲಿಪಿಡಿ ವೆಂಕಟಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ
ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ 3/4.3.1903ನೇ ಇಸವಿಗೆ 1932 ನೇ
ಸಂವತ್ಸರ ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಸಂವತ್ಸರದ ಫಾಲ್ಗುಣ ಬಹುಳ ಅಮಾವಾಸ್ಯೆ
ಶನಿವಾರ ದಿವಸ ಬರೆದುಕೊಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರ:—

ಈ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಹೀಗಿವೆ.

2262

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ಯರು ಸೇರಿ ಸಂಘವೊಂದನ್ನು
12.5.1902 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಸಂಘದ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್
ಹುಡುಗರಿಗೆ ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ವಿದ್ಯೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡುವುದು. ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು
ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ
ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ
ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು
ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು
ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು.
ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು
ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ
ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ
ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ
ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು
ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು.
ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು
ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು
ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು
ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ
ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಾಯಿತು.

Subd

1) Two Rupee Stamp affd
(Stamp suffic.)

2.) Arzi covering order appealed
agst, produced

3). Out of time by more than
6 months (exclusive of
the time taken for
grant of the copy).

Petition to be returned for
explanation of the delay
in appealing.

Sd
26-2-03

28/2/03

Notarpete
NB
3/3
4-3-1903

Rec
18/2/03

1902-03

No. 1932

Name of Petitioner Bagepalli Lakshmi Narasappa

Village Kaiba

Taluk Kortagere

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi -2-03

Date of Receipt 5-2-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Two.

ABSTRACT

Appeals against the 19
Comr's order No 335-
26-3-02. in the matter of
the flower garden of Sri
Kailaseswara Swami Temple
at Honnavalli, Tiptur Taluk.

Order.

(To the II Gent. Asst (Comr)

" The land in dispute
belongs to the S. No 141 "
which the temple claims
When I was in it is not
evidently found to be belong
ing to the temple. The
besides, maintenance

himself has admitted that
his ancestors were paying
every year Rs. 1-12-9 to the
temple for the enjoyment
of the land as garden. In
the Survey Settlement, the
land was assessed at Rs. 5-00
Only because it was thus
assessed, the rent cannot be
cancelled and his statement to the effect
that he will pay only the
assessed amount, cannot
be accepted. As the amount
of rent was paid to the
temple, the temple must be
considered as the superior
holder of the land. Therefore,
he must not only pay the
amount assessed in the
Settlement to the Govt, but
also he must pay to the
temple the usual rent
Rs. 1-12-9. This must be
clearly explained to him,
and if he consents, it
must be recorded, or if
he does not consent, his
Statement must be taken
In case he disagrees, he
may be dispossessed of
the land which will
be to some other

in behalf of the temple,
and arrangements
may be made so that
out of the entire income
the amount due to Govt.
(with cess) will be paid
to Govt. and the remain-
der be utilised for
the temple. There is
no necessity to wait
for permission of this
Hon'ble in the matter.
The Amildar of Tiptur
will be directed ac-
cordingly."

The petr. urges the
following grounds of
appeal:—

That it is against
law, records and cir-
cumstances of the case
that he should be dis-
possessed of the land
not paying the extra
amount, viz: rent — the
land which his ancestors
more than 40 centuries
has been enjoying for

possession, enjoyment, khata and all. I ~~for more than half a century~~.

That it is not just and inconsistent with Rules and Regulations, That a man should be compelled to pay more than what was fixed in the Settlement.

That it is contrary to law that the temple should be considered as Superior Holder and the petn. the Inferior Holder of the land which the petr's ancestors were given by Govt. with its khata.

For these reasons the petn. prays that the order appealed against may be set aside and pending the decision of this appeal, the execution of the order appealed against may be stayed

24/2/03

1932
5-2-03

Registered
5-2-03
Rs. Rupee Stamp
Rs. Eight annas

1932

1932

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible] 1852 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1899 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 27. 6. 1901 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1902 [illegible] 26 [illegible]

3 35 [illegible]

[illegible]: — [illegible]

[illegible] (1-12-9) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] —

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು

ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಸಹ ಗ್ರಾಹಕರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಗ್ರಾಹಕರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರಿಗೂ ಲಾಭವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

4 ನೇಯದು - ಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರು ಸರಕಿನ ಗುಣಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಪರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಸರಕಿನ ಗುಣಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳಿ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ :

ಸ್ಪರ್ಧೆಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವ ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರವಾಗಲಿ ಅದು ಸಹಕಾರ ತತ್ವದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು. Superior Holder ಅಂಥ ಮಾತುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಹಕಾರ ತತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸಮಾನರು. ಯಾರೂ ಮೇಲಲ್ಲ ಕೀಳಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಇರಬೇಕು.

3 ನೇಯದು - ಮಿಶ್ರಿಯಿಂದ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಬೆಲೆಗೆ ಸರಕನ್ನು ಮಾರಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಹ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಒಂದೇ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ದರವನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

2 ನೇಯದು :- ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾತಿ ಧರ್ಮ ಮತ ಪಂಥಗಳ ಭೇದ ಭಾವವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಾಲಗಾರರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಲಗಾರರ ಪ್ರಾಮಾಣಿಕತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

1 ನೇಯದು - ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರಕನ್ನು ಮಾರಬೇಕು. ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಸರಕನ್ನು ಮಾರಬಾರದು. ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಸರಕನ್ನು ಮಾರಿದರೆ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಿಗಬೇಕಾದ ಸವಲತ್ತುಗಳು ಸಿಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸಹಕಾರ ತತ್ವಗಳು :-

ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ತತ್ವಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]:— [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 216 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]— [illegible]

re 315 Enl + 316 D 28/7/03

as.
18—11—1902

Re 315 En 4 & 316 dy 28/7/03

Government.

MYSORE ~~DIWAN'S OFFICE~~,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No.s 2262 in 1522 of 1932-7 dated 6th March 1903 received in the ~~Dewan's~~ Muzrai Secretariat- Office from Bagepally Lakshminarayanappa residing at Koratgere appealing against the order of the Dy. Comr. Tumkur Dt. in the matter of ~~the flower~~ a certain land ~~garden~~ attached to the Sri Kailasa Eswara Swami Temple at Honnavalli, Tiptur Taluk are ~~is~~ forwarded, together with ~~its~~ their three enclosures, to the

Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District for the submission of the entire records connected with the case together with a detailed report on the subject-

By Order,

BANGALORE,
~~10~~ 3. 1903

~~Muzrai~~ Secretary

Muzrai dept.

Ent to pl. see

ks
15/7/03

Muz 5. MYSORE MUZRA DEPT.

ನಂ 316

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣಕಚೇರಿ
ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ.

ಇಂಡಾರಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ

ನಿವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ 1932 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಮಾಹೆ ಗಳ
2, ನೇ ಮತ್ತು 6 ನೇ ಮತ್ತು ನೇ ನಂಬರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಗಳನ್ನು

ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಇದೆ

ಬ ತಾರೀಖು 28 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಜುಲೈ 1903 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Deputy Muzrai Secretary.

E GOVT NMENT
327

1903 04

From The Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur

To The Deputy Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Mauzam Department

Dated 12th August 1903.

Despatched 8-9-03

Received

General No 12.
No.

Enclosure No. 4 and 1 file

9/9/03

Re

Reporting on the appeal petition of Pageputti Lakshmi-narayappa against Deputy Commissioners order directing to pay a certain amount and above the survey assessment to the Kankaleswara Swamy temple at Honnavalli Tipatur Taluk

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Tumkur District,
Tumkur 16th August 1903.

From

T Doraswamy Iyer Esq,
Acting Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

To

L Anantaswami Rao Esq, B.A,
Deputy Secretary to the Govt of Mysore,
Muzarai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No 318 dated 28th July 1903 calling for the entire records connected with the case in which Bagepalli Lakshmanaranappa has appealed to the Government against the order of the Deputy Commissioner directing him to pay a certain amount over and above the Survey assessment to the Kailaseswara Swami temple at Honnavalli of the Tiptur Taluk as his ancestors were doing, I have the honor to state that on 7th December 1897 one Thimmappiah of Honnavalli, Pensioned Head Gumasta, submitted a petition to the Government alleging that the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kailaseswara Swami temple have been alienated; that another land in which the temple is situated is in the occupation and enjoyment of the appellant Naranappa,

and

Assessment
Rs 6 - - -
7 — —
Holland
A. G.
5 - 20
2 - 14
Dry
Bagayat
223
326

and that for its better management Dharma
darsis may be appointed. This section have
been reserved for disposal to this office (vide
official memorandum No 616 dated 15th Decem-
ber 1899 from the Munzerai Secretary) an
enquiry was started and it was ascertained
that the 2 lands noted in the margin (vide
Extract of Quit Rent Register, paper No 18 in
vernacular records) were endowed as Inam
to the temple in question The garden land
No 326 is now in the possession of one Sunkada
Ramanna Pavam who seems to have purchas
(vide sale deed paper No 20 in file) ~~it~~ for Rs 95/-
from Nagappa, Shanbhog of Shankaranhelli
on the 29th September 1886, as also the land
No 223 from the same person without con-
sideration It is reported that Sunkada
Ramanna has arranged to get the worship
done regularly in the temple out of the proceeds
of these lands and he is now prepared to res-
tore the lands to Government if it is so decided

2 With regard to the land contended for by
the appellant, it was formerly a Hoovina Thot
(-flower garden) of the temple. This flower gar-
den was in the occupancy of the appellant's
ancestors, who, as admitted by appellant

used to pay to the temple annually a
sum of Rs 1-12 9 During the time of Survey
and Settlement it was treated as Survey
No 340, with an area of 1-10 and reserving 8 guntas
as kharab for the temple therein situated,
the rest of the area viz 1-2 was assessed at Rs 5/-
It is now in the enjoyment of the said Lakshma-
narayanappa for the past 20 years The Deputy
Commissioner, the late Mr B G Krishnangar
went to the spot and on personal inspection
was of opinion that though the land in question
appeared to be outside the precincts of the temple
yet it was really attached to it and that
Lakshmnarayanappa who was enjoying it must
be held to be an inferior holder. Accordingly
he passed an order to the effect that the
appeal petitioner should execute a Muchalika
binding himself to pay the Kandayam amount
of ~~Rs~~ 1-12-9 to the temple as previously agreed
to by his (Lakshmnarayanappa's) ancestors
at the time of their taking possession of the
said land, failing which he would be
deprived of the enjoyment of the land (vide
order No 335 dated 26th March 1913 in verna-
cular file) It is against this order that the
present appeal has been preferred On
further correspondence upon the subject

1 Mr. R. Ry Sankarla Ramanna narain of Hanamakonda.
2 Subba Rao, Shanbhog of Mutthahal Taluka.

notice was served to appellant to appear before the Deputy Commissioner and his statement was recorded on 13th May 1903 Lakshminarayanappa has agreed to pay rs 60/- once for all in lieu of the annual payment of rs 1-12 9 and wished to have the undisturbed possession of the land in question, but as yet he has not paid up the amount

3 As regards the appointment of Dharmadarsis to manage the temple affairs the Shikdar proposes the names of the marginally noted persons and I recommend that they be accepted. 903

4 The vernacular records relating to the case are herewith forwarded The petition with its enclosure is herewith returned

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

MUZRAI

1901

From

The Dy Secretary to

To Govt, Muzrai Dept

To

The Dy Commr

Dated 30 Tumkur Dt-

Despatched

Received September 190

General No. 805

Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. 4 and one file

With reference to his

~~Demk~~ Letter no 102/327 dated

8th instant, reporting

on the appeal petition of

Bangalli Lakshmiana-

-iya regarding the levy

of Kandayam from him,

on one of the lands belonging

the Kalleshwaraswami

temple at Hanumalli in

the Sylter Taluk, have the

 honour

honour to observe from the
petitioner Lakshminarasappa's
petition to the Dy Assistant
of the Kortigere Taluk -
(paper no 26 in the file)
that the same question was
once decided in 1866, upon
the complaint-petition of
Hanumanthi Somappa and
others -

Requests that the
papers connected with
the order of 1866 referred
to above together with all
the connected papers may
be submitted for reference

Encls returned

29/9/03

DPI

28/9/03

1903 ok

From The Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur

To The Deputy Secretary to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Mungaram Department

Dated 16th February 1904

Despatched 17th February 1904

Received

General No. 393

No.

Enclosure No. 4 Files

Submitting certain revenue extract papers connected with the refusal preferred by Lakshminarasiah regarding the levy of Rs 1 12-9 in addition to the kandayam due on one of the lands belonging to the Sri Narasimha Swami temple at Honnavalli in Sira Taluk

MYSC

1842.

SECRETARIAT

Rec'd
18/2/04

R. K

Please put up a note for orders

28/3/04

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Tumkur District,
Tumkur 15th February 1904.

From

K. P. Puttanna Chetty Esq,
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To

C. Anandarami Rao Esq, B.A,
Deputy Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Inam Department.

With reference to your Arshad No. 805 dated 30th September 1903 calling for the submission of certain records in connection with the appeal preferred by Lakshmanamurthappa regarding the levy of Rs. 1 12-9 in addition to the kandayam due on one of the lands belonging to Sri Kalleshwara and Umamaheshwara Temple at Honnavalli I have the honour to submit herewith the papers relating with the late Honnavalli Taluk Amildar's report No. 664 dated 28th March 1866 to the original order referred to in the petition of the Appellant viz, No. 367 dated 11th April 1866 issued from this office in reply to the Amildar's report No. 664 dated 28th March 1866 as requested to

be

be missing, the retained from the Jo regulee
mentioned in the office is filed with the
record for reference.

2 The other record mentioned by the
appellant, viz, papers connected with the
dakhast presented by Chunnilal Roy in 1854 55, on behalf of the appellant is reported to be missing in the records maintained in the Sadar office (vide Annexure NT. report No 431 dated 11th January 1904, below No 36 of the file).

3 The vernacular record and the appeal petition with its enclosure, received with the docket under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner
Sundarbans

MUZRAI

19 —19 911

From The ~~DEPUTY~~ SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To
The Inam Supt. in
Mysore

Dated 13th } April 1904
Despatched 13th }

Received

General No. 3233
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honour to
request that he may be sent
from the Inam Regr—
particulars of the Inam lands
endowed to the
Kailasaswamiswami temple
at Hemmadi in the
Tiptur Sub. Taluk

Dy.
Supt.
19 4 04
Mysore

Asst.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2798
SECRETARIAT

1904

From
The Superintendent of Police
Sandalwood Affairs in Mysore

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Municipal Department

Dated Coimbatore
Despatched 12th May
Received
General No.
No. 129.
Enclosure No.

Rec'd
12/5/04

Rptes

Ack
13/5/04

With reference to the
docket No 3233 of the
13th April 1904.

With reference to the
above, I have the honor to state
that no inam land is
endowed to the Sri Kanda-
-swamy Temple
at Hosur in the
Sattur Taluk.

Superintendent of Police
Sandalwood Affairs

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

19 —19

From M. Srinivasa Rao Esq.
M. LAKSHMINARASIMHARAO, B.A., B.L.,
~~Deputy~~ Secretary to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Dated 24th May 1904.

Despatched

Received

General No. 3632.
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

His Docket No. 129/12 dt. 17th May 1904.

With ref^ce to the above, I have the honor to state that the temple of Sri Kailaseswara at Koumaralli in the Tipturu Taluk is also known as Kalle Devar, and to which the marginally noted lands are reported to have been

i) Reg. 223/1901-02. Extent 5-20. Assessment 6-0-0.
ii) Inam Garden 3.26. 2-14. 7-0-0
in Koumaralli Kobli of the Tipturu Taluk.

attached as Devadaya inam.

It is requested that an extract of the Inam Regr. pertaining to the grant of these lands as inam to the temple, may be forwarded to this Office.

By order

&

Advt

Asst Secy

Rd
20/5/24

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3149.
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

1904 G.M.

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements at Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated Muzrai Department - Cotacamund.

Despatched 6th June

Received 9th June

General No. 134

No.

Enclosure No. one

As requested in his docket No. 3632 of the 21st May 1904, has the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Inam register of the Inam Lands bestowed to the temple of Sri Kalleswara devaru at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk.

I have the honor to be Sir Your most obedient servant Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore


Register Sheet No. 10.

Taluk - Honnavalli.
Hobli - Honnavalli.
Village - Honnavalli.

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Hanavalli in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry, wet or garden	Extent Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
19.	Devadaya	Dry	— 6 —	3.97
		wet.	1 — 3 — 8	2.43
				6.40

Sammat of Honnavalli in the Taluk of Honnavalli

DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND			
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, &c, whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, &c or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, &c., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the ryots to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	
2-2-11 6-13-3 9-15-2	"	For the Support of the temple which is said to be in good order & poojas performed.-	5-13-1.

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted, and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given
10	11
Swalpa Inam Account 1844 Dry 6-a wet 1-3-8 Kalledevar	

of Doomkur

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poonnah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14

of the Vandydrug

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, &c., of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, &c.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Meenakshi Kalledevar Pujari Chondiah The land is in the possession of Sabbayah			

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant by the Inam Comm
19	
To be confirmed on ⅛ Gift rent plus the existing Jodi viz^z Rs. 6-— (Signed) G. Rookard Asst^t Compulsory 19/1/70	To be confirmed Commuted Quit Rent 6 Rupees Initialed B. Gopala Rao 26/3/70 Chief Assistant
Rs. 2-14-7 blue deducted from the Annuation account of a similar sum eliminated from the Mewdpur list, balance of Jodi Blue paid in the case - Rs 3. (Signed) F. Clerk Nov^r-12-70	Confirmed subject to a quit rent of Rupees 6- (Signed) F. Clerk Inam Comm^r June 23 70
Main Supt^s Office Sanctioned by 6th June 1904 Compd [illegible]	Copy. [illegible] Supt^t of Main Office in Mysore

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
~~Deputy~~ *Secretary to the Govt. of*
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Dy Commr
Kumsur District

Dated

Despatched 26th October 1904

Received

General No. 1469
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. one bundle

With reference to his letter no 393/1842 dated 17th February 1904 and the Kumsi Supt's Docket- no 134/3149 dated 9th June '04 regarding the approval proposed by Lakshmi- -narasimha in the matter of levying Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the Survey assessment imposed a

(S.No 223)

on the Inam land belonging
to the Sri Kylasaswaraswami
temple at Hanamalli
in the Gunkur Taluk, has
the honour to enquire why
the Inam land, which belongs
to the temple, was fully
assessed during the
Survey Settlement —

The enclosures are
herewith returned for
reference and resubmission —

Dft —

Survey

23/10/04

MYSORE
MUZRAI

Re 2201.

Rupees

24/11/04

Note cont'd & submtd
30/11/04

2116

1904

From K Doraswamy Iyer Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To K Ananthaswamy Rao Esq B A
Secretary to the Govt of
H H. the Maharaja of
Mysore, Muzarai Dept.

Dated Mysore, Muzarai Dept. 14th November 1904.

Despatched 22nd

Received

General No. 350
No.

Enclosure No. 2 files

With reference to Muzara Secretary's docket No. 1469 dated 26th October 1904, enquiring why the Inam Land (S No. 223) granted to the Sri Kylaseswara Swami temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk, was fully assessed during the Survey Settlement, the undersigned has the honor to state that it is S. No: 340 in the holding of the appellant, on which the temple stands, that has been fully assessed and not S No: 223

The Vernacular files

received with the docket under reply
returned.

[illegible]
for deputy Commissioner

Amraoti 911

To

The Dy Commr

Amraoti Dt.

No: 2133 dt 2 Dec 04

Dated 9th December 1904.

His Docket- no 350

dated 22nd November 1904.

With reference to the above has the honour to draw his attention again to this Office Docket- no 1469 dated 26th October 1904, and to observe that the question as to whether the therein asked Income which belongs to the temple, was fully assessed during the Survey Settlement, has not been answered in

in the present Communication

under reply - The Dy Comrs

is requested to furnish ~~the~~ details on this point - ~~required information~~,

~~together with the information~~

~~sent~~ In whose name

the Khata stands should

also be kindly reported -

The Cases are returned

for reference and resubmission.

By order

Dft -

4/12/04

Secretary to Govt -

Emigration Dept

4/12/04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3172
SECRETARIAT

1904-05 318

From K Doraiswamy Ayer Esq,
Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

To L Ananthasama Rao Esq, B.A,
Secretary to the Government of
H H the Maharaja of Mysore,
Mulgund Department.

Dated 18th February 1905.

Despatched 22nd February 1905.

Received

General No. 604
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

In reply to Mulgund
Secretary's docket No 2133
dated the 22nd November 1904
enquiring why the land
Survey No 340 belonging to
Sri Kyleswara Swami temple
at Honnavalli in the Tiptur
Taluk was fully assessed
during the Survey Settle-
ment, &c, undersigned
has the honor to state that
prior to the introduction
of Survey and Settlement

the land in question was not a separate Inam land endowed to the temple like survey nos: 223 and 326 which are treated as Inam but it was only a vacant strip of land within the temple premises which had been converted into a flower garden for the use of the temple.

2 About the year 1854-55, one Narasinga Rao who had obtained the adjoining land for cultivation on behalf of his relative Bageppalli Subba Rao, formerly Amildar of Honnavalli, obtained the said vacant strip also with the consent of the villagers on condition of his (Narasinga Rao) improving the strip by levelling and planting it up with cocoanut trees and flower plants. A sum of Rs 14-4 is stated to have been paid by Bageppalli Subba Rao as assessment for the same for the benefit of the temple. Subsequently, i.e., in 1865 on the complaint of one Sivappa alleging that the temple land had

had been in the unlawful enjoyment of the present petitioner's father, a detailed personal enquiry was held into the matter, by the Amildar which stated that the land remained in the possession and enjoyment of Munshi Subba Rao (petitioner's father). By this time the Accounts trees having come into bearing the small assessment of Rs 14-0 was, on the Amildar's recommendation raised to Rs 1-12 0 by the then Deputy Commissioner. Since the said strip of land, situate within the temple premises, was not shewn in the Jari Inami accounts and was consequently omitted from the operations of the Inam settlement.

3 During the Survey Settlement however the land having been shewn as in the enjoyment of the petitioner's ancestor, the whole strip of the land in question and the temple was constituted into a separate numbering,

survey No 340. to extent of 4 G 1-8, on which the temple building and a well, stand was declared as kharab and the remaining 4 G 1-2 was assessed at Rs 5/- in the year Vibrama (1880-81).

4 The petitioner having protested against paying Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the assessment of Rs 5/- imposed on the land. Mr B.G. Krishnaiyer, the then Deputy Commissioner, who inspected the spot held that the land, though fully assessed at the survey Settlement, was undoubtedly the property of the temple, the holder thereof being Sri Kylaseswara Swami and directed that the petitioner must either continue to pay to the temple the sum of Rs 1-12-9 in addition to the assessment payable to Government or to quit the land. The petitioner did not heed this order, and when subsequently, he was called upon to produce any documentary evidence in support of his contention he

the (petitioner, appeared before the In.S Narayana Rao and promised in writing to deposit a sum of Rs 60/- by the end of August 1903 to be invested in the Govern. ment Savings Bank to the benefit of the temple, the interest realizable thereon (Rs 1-12-9) being utilized for expenditure in the temple. He has failed to do this.

5. The khata was, till 1893-94, in the name of Narasinga Rao and has since been transferred to the petitioner Lakshmi-narasappa

6 The file of vernacular records received with the docket under reply is herewith returned.

R R Bhimacharya
for Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

2 Files 9117

Proceedings of the

Court of H. H. the Maharaja

of Mysore

Mysore

Read. —

Petitions nos 2262/1522

and 1932 dated 2nd

February and 6th March

1903 respectively, from

Bangalli Lakshmiamma,

appealing against the

order of the Dy Comr

of the Tumkur District

relating to

~~directing~~ the payment of

the full assessment on

a certain piece of land (Survey No 340) belonging to the Sri Kylaseswara Swami temple at Honnavalli in the ~~Tumkur~~ Tiptur Taluk,

~~a temple land~~ in addition

to what was being paid

to the Trustee.

And Correspondence

ending with letter no

604 dated 22nd February 1905,
from the Dy Commr,
Tumkur District, submitting
the records connected
with the case.

~~~

Order:— No. 3542 Civil file

From the records it is 26.3.05
observed as follows:—

~~During the Inam settlement~~
~~of 1870~~ The unregistered
lands ~~unregistered~~ belonging
~~Devadaya Inam~~ to the
~~Kotteswaraswami~~ Kylasaswaraswami temple
at Hanumalli in the
Tipturu Taluk. Lakshminarayana,
the applicant, was in the
enjoyment of S.No 340, paying
Rs 1-12-9 to the temple; and
one Lankada Ramanna
is in the possession of
S. Nos 326 and 223, having


~~~

having purchased them
from one Nagappa in
1886. Complaints having
been received that the
temple lands in question had
been alienated to ~~[illegible]~~
third parties contrary
to rules, ~~[illegible]~~,
it was ascertained
in the local enquiry
that the appellant was (I.L.R. 3 M 340)
enjoying the land paying
only Rs 1-12-9 to the
temple and not Rs 5
which was the assessment
imposed on the land
in addition, during the
Survey Settlement of
1880-81, and that
Lankanda Ramanna
had arranged to get-

the worship done regularly
in the temple out of the
proceeds of the lands that
were in his possession & the
Dy Comr, the late Mr. P. G. Krishniengar
therefore directed in the case
of the appellant Lakshmi
narasimha that he should
in 1903,
execute a muchulika binding
himself to pay to the temple
Rs 1-12-9 as usual in addition
£ to the full assessment of
Rs 5 imposed on the land
during the Survey Settlement.
2 The present appeal from
the Lakshmi narasimha is against
the order. He contends
Rs that the Council he made
or liable to pay anything
is to the temple, so long
as he pays the full Survey
assessment

assessment on the lands in question. The Dy Comr did not pass any orders as regards the lands in the possession of Lukondo Ramanna-

2. With reference to the land in the enjoyment of the appellant viz S. no 340, the Govt observe that his objection cannot be accepted, as the Inamy assessment must be paid to Govt and as the temple, to which the land clearly belongs, cannot forego the amount due to it- as the Inamdar. The Dy Comr's order in

(4 in this respect is therefore
h upheld and the appeal
is rejected. If the appellant-
h refuses to pay the amount-
w of Rs 1-12-9 in addition
D to the assessment due ~~from~~
on the land, he may be
ousted from its possession
and it may be leased out-
to others on the same or
more advantageous terms.

3. The appellant-pays
that the lands may be left-
in his undisturbed possession
receiving from him a lump
sum of Rs 60 in lieu of the
annual payment of Rs 1-12-9
to the temple. Such
Commutation is not-
possible, as has been already
observed in the Govt- Es

No R 338-400 dated
R Ft 28-1902

24th February 1903. The
Dy Comr is requested
to inform the applicant-
accordingly -

4. As regards the
lands in the enjoyment
of Lankada Ramanna
viz S. nos 223 & 326, the
Govt observe that
Nagappa, from whom
the lands ~~are~~ were said
to have been purchased,
had no right to sell
~~the lands~~ which belonged
to the temple. As the
sale took place in 1886
the lands will have to
be treated under clause
B of the Alienation Rules
of 1877. They should

(4) accordingly be ordered to be restored to the Institution as agreed to by the alienee. The Dy Comr ~~is enquired~~ to may have out these lands to the same individual if favourable terms are offered by him in favour of the temple.

5. The Dy Comr proposes the appointment of the marginally-noted two persons as Dharmakartas to manage the temple affairs. This recommendation is approved. A separate notification to that effect will accordingly issue.

(Demi-official) 22/3/05

(1) M. R. Ry Sankaralinga Ramanuja Mudaliar Avargal
(2) " Sabapathy Pillai, Dharmakarta of Vadakkal Temple

22/3/05

Secretary to Govt

P. S. O.

To

The Dy Comrs Tumkur

District, returning

the Voters' Lists —

Dated the 1st

Dated

No 3543

Dt 26.3.05

Magistrate

Notification

The undermentioned gentlemen are appointed Dharmakarsies to supervise the affairs of the Sri Kylasaswara-swami temple at Hanwella in the Siyane Taluk:—

M. R. Ry Sinkanda Ramanathan of Hanwella

" Subha Row, Shanbhagam of Kattikulam Pinka

(Demands order) 22/2/05

Secretary Magistrate's Office

To The Compiler Government Gazette for publication in Eng & Vernacular G. G. O.

No 5544 Dy 26 3.05.
Copy forwarded

to the Dy Commr Tuticorin
District, in continuation
of Govt Ltr no 3542
dated 26th March 1905

By
Secretary

22/3/05

ప్రస్తావిత విషయమునకు సంబంధించిన
నివేదిక సమర్పించినచో తీసుకోవలసిన
చర్యలు గురించి ప్రభుత్వమునకు కోరుతూ
ఈ.ఎం.ఎస్-12-7 తేదీన సమర్పించిన వాటికి కొంత
కాల వ్యవధి ఇవ్వవలసిందిగా కోరుతూ
తిరుమల తిరుపతి దేవస్థానం వారు కోరిన
విషయమును పరిశీలించి తగు చర్యలు
తీసుకొనుటకు ఈ కార్యాలయం వారు
కూడా ఆసక్తి కనబరుస్తూ ఉన్నారు.
కనుక ఈ విషయమును పరిశీలించి
తగు చర్యలు తీసుకొనుటకు ఈ కార్యాలయం
వారికి ఇంకా కొంత సమయం అవసరమని
తెలియుచున్నది.

By order

for

Secretary to Govt

Municipal Affairs)

To

Sir,

READ—

Petitions Nos. 2262—1522 and 1932, dated 2nd February and 6th March 1903, respectively, from Bagepalli Lakshminaranappa, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District, relative to the payment of the full assessment on a certain piece of land (Survey No. 340) belonging to the Sri Kylaseswaraswami temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk, in addition to what was being paid to the Institution.

And correspondence ending with letter No. 604, dated 22nd February 1905, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, submitting the records connected with the case.

No. 3542, DATED BANGALORE, 26TH MARCH 1905.

ORDER THEREON.—From the records it is observed as follows:—

K. K. P.	Old assessment.	Jodi payable
Dry 0-6-0	Rs. 2-2-11	Rs. 3-0-0 (old)
Wet 1-3-8	„ 6-13-3	

S. No.	Extent A g.	Assessment. Rs. a. p.	
223 Dry	... 5 20	6 0 0	(new)
326 Bagayet	... 2 14	7 0 0	
340 Part do	... 1 2	5 0 0	

The marginally noted lands belong to the Sri Kylaseswaraswami temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taulk. Lakshminaranappa, the appellant, was in the enjoyment of Survey No. 340, paying Rs. 1-12-9 to the temple; and one Sunkada Ramanna is in the possession of Survey Nos. 326 and 223, having purchased them from one Nagappa in 1886. Complaints having been received that the temple lands in question had been alienated to third parties contrary to rules, it was ascertained in the local enquiry that the appellant was enjoying the land (S. No. 340) paying only Rs. 1-12-9 to the temple and not Rs. 5 which was the assessment imposed on the land in addition, during the Survey Settlement of 1880-81; and that Sunkada Ramanna had arranged to get the worship done regularly in the temple out of the proceeds of the lands that were in his possession, *viz.*, Survey Nos. 223 and 326. The Deputy Commissioner, the late Mr. B. G. Krishnaiengar, thereupon directed in the case of the appellant Lakshminaranappa in 1903 that he should execute a mutchalika binding himself to pay to the temple Rs 1-12-9 as usual *in addition to* the full assessment of Rs. 5 imposed on the land during the Survey Settlement. The present appeal from Lakshminaranappa is against this order. He contends that he cannot be made liable to pay anything to the temple, so long as he pays the full survey assessment on the lands in question. The Deputy Commissioner did not pass any orders as regards the lands in the possession of Sunkada Ramanna.

2. With reference to the land in the enjoyment of the appellant, *viz.*, Survey No. 340, the Government observe that his objection cannot be accepted, as the survey assessment must be paid to Government and as the temple, to which the land clearly belongs, cannot forego the amount due to it as the inamdar. The Deputy Commissioner's order in this respect is therefore upheld and the appeal rejected. If the appellant refuses to pay the amount of Rs. 1-12-9 in addition to the assessment due on the land, he may be ousted from its possession and it may be leased out to others on the same or more advantageous terms.

3. The appellant prays that the lands may be left in his undisturbed possession receiving from him a lump sum of Rs. 60 in lieu of the annual payment of Rs. 1-12-9 to the temple. Such commutation is not possible, as has been already observed in the Government Proceedings No. R. 338-400—R. F. 28-1902, dated 24th February 1903. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to inform the appellant accordingly.

4. As regards the lands in the enjoyment of Sunkada Ramanna, *viz.*, Survey Nos. 223 and 326, the Government observe that Nagappa, from whom the lands were said to have been purchased, had no right to sell the lands which belonged to the temple. As the sale took place in 1886 the lands will have to be treated under clause B of the Alienation Rules of 1877. They should accordingly be ordered to be restored to the

Muzrai, dated 26th March 1905.

Institution as agreed to by the alienee. The Deputy Commissioner may lease out these lands to the same individual if favorable terms are offered by him in favor of the temple.

5. The Deputy Commissioner proposes the appointment of the marginally noted two persons as Dharmadarsees to manage the temple affairs. This recommendation is approved. A separate notification to that effect will accordingly issue.

M R Ry Sunkada Ramanna of Honnavalli.
„ Subba Rao, Shanbhog of Muttihal Firka

Draft

Muzrai Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning vernacular papers.

Exd.—C. V.

1904-05

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 26th March 1905

No. 3542

Passing orders on the appeal petition of Bagepalli Lakshminaranappa in the matter of certain lands belonging to the Sri Kylas'swaraswami temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk.

SBP—31-3-05—200

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃಷಿಇ ೨೦೨೨ ಪಿಎಂಎಫ್‌ಎಂಇ ೧೭೨೨೨

ಕೃಷಿ ಉದ್ಯಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರ (ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಸಿ ಹೊರತುಪಡಿಸಿ) ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನೆರವು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಕುರಿತು.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ೧. ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಹಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಕರಣಾ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯದ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕೆಎ-೧೩೦೧೨/೧೨/೨೦೨೧-ಪಿಎಂಎಫ್‌ಎಂಇ ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೫.೦೩.೨೦೨೨.

೨. ಕೃಷಿ ಉದ್ಯಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರ (ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಸಿ ಹೊರತುಪಡಿಸಿ) ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನೆರವು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಕುರಿತು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಹಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಕರಣಾ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯದ ಮಾರ್ಗಸೂಚಿಗಳು.

ಮೇಲಿನ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿತ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಹಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಕರಣಾ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯದ ಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷಿ ಉದ್ಯಮ ಕೇಂದ್ರ (ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಎಫ್‌ಪಿಸಿ ಹೊರತುಪಡಿಸಿ) ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನೆರವು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಕುರಿತು ಮಾರ್ಗಸೂಚಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಹ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ ಆನ್‌ಲೈನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಹ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ ಆನ್‌ಲೈನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಡಿ ಸಹಾಯಧನ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಹ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ ಆನ್‌ಲೈನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Key order

Secretary to Govt.
Mysuru Department

10944 28.8.05.

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿರಿಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ

ನಾನು ಕಳೆದ ಹಲವಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾಗ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಾಂತರಗಳಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಈ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಈ ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರ ಕಛೇರಿ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By order

Secy Mun Dept

19/8/05

Secy Mun Dept

No. 1095 Dt 28.8.05

Copy to the Commr. in Tumkur Dt

in connn. of Govt Pro: No 3542 Dt

Voh/Municipal/05.

By order

Secy Mun Dept

7/8/05

7

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated 190

No. 1164/1

Rupees Rs 1/12/0



Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja,

transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja

of Mysore, in the Agroi Department, Bangalore, for

No. 799 of 05-06

By Order,

I. C. S.

Private Secretary

to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

15.12.05

Copy to the Dy. Comm. Tumkur for information

in Contn of this office no 1095, dt 26th August 05

By order

Secretary

10/12/05

Copy to the Dy. Comm. Tumkur for information

in Contn of this office no 1094, dt 26th August 05

By order

Secretary

10/12/05

Part I

To,

The Govt Advocate.

Bangalore

Sir,

No. 3764 dt 31.10.07 encls 2 and one file (No 56-05)

I am directed to forward herewith The entire murz file no 56 of 1905 ending with Govt Dno no 3542 dated 26th march 1905, directing ~~apart from collection of~~, the levy from Bagepalli Lakshmi Narayappa, of a sum of ~ Rs 1-12-9 for the enjoyment of the Bagayet land bearing S. no 340, measuring 1 acre and 2 guntas and assessed at Rs 5/- endowed to the Sri Kylaseswaraswamy temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk.

c/him

The Dy-Commr of the Tumkur Distt has submitted

with his docket no 616

dated 14th January 1907, ~~(not to hand)~~

a notice in original (both of which are forwarded herewith in original)

under Section 424 of the ~~Code~~

Civil Procedure Code

issued by the said individual

intimating his intention

to file a suit in the

Civil Court, on the grounds To establish his claim to the land. The Dy Comm^r solicits the orders of Govt in the matter.

~~That as the recorded cultivation was classified as Govt land and as the patta was made out in his name during the Survey settlement, he is not liable for the claim of the Hubli Municipality which is not expressly imposed at that time and has solicited orders of Govt~~

I am directed to request

That you will be good enough to furnish your opinion as to whether the Dy. Comm. may be directed to contest the suit on behalf of the temple.

2. The entire file may be returned herewith along with your reply.

I have etc.

Dft) 30/1/07
Secretary.

30/1/07

No 149

Office of the Government Advocate
in Mysore, Bangalore.
Dated 12th February 1907.

From

The Government Advocate in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of H.H. the
Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai, Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.3764 dated 31st Ultimo, I have the honor to state that both in the original order of the Deputy Commissioner and in the final - appeal proceedings of Government referred to therein, it is mentioned that Bagepally Lakshminaranappa gave a deposition admitting that his ancesstors were paying a sum of Rs,1-12-9 annually to the temple for the enjoyment of the land in question and that he wanted this liability to be commuted to a lump sum payment of Rs 60/-and odd- once for all. Before forming my opinion on the legal aspect of the matter contained in the notice sent to the Deputy-Commissioner by the said person, it is necessary to peruse the said statements and also to be informed when and under what circumstances the said payment ceased to be paid and whether such cessation of payment amounted to a denial of his tenancy under the temple or to a mere nonpayment of the rent as there was no regularly constituted committee to receive the same, without involving the assertion of an independant right in himself inconsistant with the right- of the temple as landlord. An earlyreply in these respects is requested as the time mentioned in the notice has already expired.

The file of papers received ~~are~~ herewith returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

S. Narayana Rao

Government Advocate.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
3470
21.2.07

1906-07

From P. Doraswamy Iyer Esq.
Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

To
L. Narasimhaswami Rao Esq. B.A.
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Mysore Department.

Dated 17th January 1907.
Despatched 19th January 1907.
Received
General No. 616
No.

Enclosure No. 1.

Earl
Refer please
W. 21/1/07

Government Proceedings
No. 3542 dated the 26th March
1905, directing that if Laksh
minarasappa refuses to
pay the amount of Rs 1-12-9
to the Sri Kailasaswara-
swami temple at Honnavalli
in the Tiptur Taluk in addit
to the assessment due on
survey No. 360 belonging
to the said temple, he may
be ousted from its possess
and it may be leased out
to others on the same or

more advantageous terms.

Adverting to the above, the undersigned has the honour to forward herewith for information in original a notice under section 424 of the Civil Procedure Code issued by Lakshmanaraonaiyar referred to in the above intimating undersigned of his intention to file a suit in the Civil Court within two months from the date of notice. This notice which was received here by the Sheristadar on 25th October 1906 has just come up before undersigned No intimation has arrived yet of the intended suit

M. Srinivasachariar

For Deputy-Commissioner.

MM

7/c 2
18/2.

Mar 1

190

From

To

The Dy Commr

Tumkur Distt.

Dated

Despatched 19th Feb. 07.

Received

General No. 3964

No.

Enclosure No. 2

Adverting to his docket no. 616 dated 17th January 1907, soliciting orders of Govt on the suit intended to be filed by one Lakshminarasappa Bagepally To establish his claim To certain lands endowed to the Sri, Kailaseswara Swamy temple at Honnavalli

in the Tiptur Taluk, has
the honor to forward herewith a
Copy of letter no 149, dated
12th Feby. 1907 from the
Govt. Advocate in Mysore
on the subject, and to request
that the particulars
therein required may be
furnished to this office
at a very early date.

2) The enclosures are herewith
returned for ref. and re-
Submission.

By order,

(Sd) 19/2/07

hs/3965/19.2.07 Secretary.

Copy to the Govt Advocate
with ref. to his letter no.
149 dy 12:2:07.

hs/18/2/07

(Sd) Secretary.

Hc

5145
13-5-07

Refers
Rs
13/5/07

Note endorsed
13/5/07

190 6.07

From The Deputy Commr
Tinnelly Distt

To The Secretary to the
Govt of H.H. the
Maha Rajah of
Travancore Mny Deptt

Dated 9th May 07

Despatched 10th

Received

General No.

No. 1/25

Enclosure No. 2 files.

His docket no
3964 dt 19th Febry 07

Reporting further
particulars on the
Quam lands endow
ed to the Sri Kailasa
vara Swamy temple
at Kannavalle in
the Tiptur Taluk

Deputy Commissioners office,
Tumkur District.

Dated, Tumkur, 9th May 1907.

From

K Doraswamie Iyer Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To L. Anantaswami Rao Esq B.A.
Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maha Rajah of Mysore.
Muzrai Department.
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No: 3964 dated the 19th February 1907, calling for certain particulars in re the suit intended to be filed by one Bagepalli Lakshmi Narnappa to establish his claim to certain Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kyla[illegible]swaraswami Temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Amildar of the Tiptur

Talak reports that the date of cessation of payment of Rs: 1-12-9 annually to the temple, or to what circumstances such cessation was due are not ascertainable now. In his statement, the said Lakshmi Narrappa has admitted that his ancestors were paying a sum of Rs: 1-12-9 annually to the temple for the enjoyment of the land in question and that he wanted this liability to be Commuted to a lump sum on payment of Rs 60/- once for all. (Paper no: 35 in the file of vernacular records enclosed herein for reference) I beg to add that the said Lakshmi Narrappa is reported to have died on the 16th December 1906

The enclosures to the re-docket under reply are also

herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your Most obedient Servant.

M. Sorensen

for Deputy Commissioner.

17/5

No. 5497/22.5.07.
Encl 1 & 2 files

To

The Govt Advocate
in Mysore

Sir, Adverting to your
letter no 149 d/12th Feb
ult regarding the
payment to Lakshmi
narainappa, of a sum
of Rs 1-12-9 to the
Sri Kailaseswaraswami
temple at Honnavalli
in the Tiptur Taluk,
I am directed to forward
herewith, Copy of letter
no 925 d/9th May 1907

I from the Dy Comm.
C of the Zamkum Dt.
furnishing particulars
required in your letter
under reply. The Remainder
records received in the
the Dy Comm's letter
ref. to above are also
forwarded herewith
for reference & transmission
when done with.
2. The favour of an
early reply is requested.

Thanks &
Yrs
19/5/47
Secretary Deptt

No 214
Encl. 1 plan & 3 papers.

5414
29.5.07

Office of the Government Advocate in Mysore.

Bangalore, dated the 27th May 1907.

From,

The Government Advocate in Mysore.

To,

The Secretory to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore Muzrai Department.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with your letter No.5497 dated 22nd Instant, I have the honour to state as follows:-

It is not clear whether the land is a Devadaya Inam. If it be one, it may, I think, be dealt with under the Inam Rules in force and no civil court will have jurisdiction to question the decision of Government arrived at under the Inam Rules.

2. On the other hand, if it be an assessed land belonging to the temple and wrongly included in the patta of Lakshminarnappa at the time of the survey and settlement, we have to see whether the temple lost its right to the same.

3. Lakshminarnappa, alleges in his petition dated 13th May 1902, that he was paying to the temple annually a sum of Rs.1-12-9 till the survey and settlement, (which must have taken place nearly 30 years ago) that as the temple land and his own land were at the survey made into one number and entered in his holding, he discontinued to make the said payment to the temple and paid the assessment fixed on the whole land to Government direct. He seems to have enjoyed the land eversince as his own and those interested in the temple do not seem to have troubled themselves

about this land during all these thirty years. From the - Canada file forwarded I am led to infer that there is no evidence forthcoming to contradict the several allegations of Lakshminarnappa as setforth above. In these circumstances it is clear that the right of the temple to the land is barred by the Law of Limitation and that there is no subsisting relationship of landlord and tenant between the temple and Lakshminarnappa who is not therefore bound to pay the - said amount of Rs.1-12-9 to the temple.

4. Lakshminarnappa's consent to pay a lump sum of Rs.60/- in lieu of the annual payment of the said sum of Rs.1-12-9 does not amount to a fresh contract and cannot be enforced if his heirs mean to back out of it. (Lakshminarnappa is reported by Amildar to have died some time ago). If his heirs be still willing to make the payment of Rs.60/-, I am of opinion, the amount may be accepted in lieu of the annual payment.

The Canada file is returned herewith.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

S. Ramayanna Rao

Government Advocate.

Draft as per orders

Mad 1 \]

190

From

To

The Dy Commr

Tumkur Distt

Dated

Despatched 9 7 07

Received

General No. 62
No.

Enclosure No. 3 Nil

Adverting to his letter no 925 dy 9th may 1907 furnishing further particulars in re the suit intended to be filed by one Bargepalle Lakshmanappa to establish his claim to certain Inam lands endowed to the Sri Kylaseswaraswamy temple at Honnavalle in the Taluk the Tahsildar has the honor to state that since the said individual is reported to have died, it is not clear whether the Dy

GPB—3000—21 7 03

Commr

~~Learned counsel expects~~ any orders of Govt on the subject of the Suit intended to be filed by the deceased. ~~The favour of a reply on this point is requested~~ are required now. The Dy Comr is requested to report on the point-

2) The Revn records are herewith returned

By order,

DCA

Secretary

3/7/07

3/6/07

1907-08

From The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District

To The Secy to the Govt
of Mysore Muzrai Dept
Bangalore

Dated 19th
Despatched Do
Received
} July 1907

General No.
No 40
Enclosure No

Ref to the letter from the

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
296
20-7-07
MUZRAI SECT

20/7/07

noted and
Draft sent
GA
26/7/07

His docket no 620
9th July 1907
stating that Lakka
Naranappa is dead
and it is not known
whether his heirs
press the claim or not

Deputy Commissioner's office,
Tumkur District

Dated, Tumkur, 19 July 1907

From

K Doraswami Iyer Esqr
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To

L Anantaswami Rao Esqr B.A.
Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maha Rajah of
Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your
docket no 62 dated the 9th July
1907 enquiring whether any
orders of Government are required
now on the subject of the suit
intended to be filed by Bagepalli
Lakshminarayappa to establish
his claim to certain Inam lands
endowed to the Sri Kylase-
-swara Swamy Temple at Honna
valli in the Tiptur Taluk, I have
the honor to state that the said
Lakshmi Narayappa gave a

notice intending to file a suit in the Civil Court against the Deputy Commissioner. This notice was forwarded to Government soliciting instructions in the matter. Lakshmi Narayappa is now dead and it is not known if the heirs mean to press the claim.

The vernacular records on the subject are retained here.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

For Deputy Commissioner

No 61 7,07
19

his heirs intend ~~of~~ presently
their claim.

With reference to the above,
has the honor to state that
no orders of Govt are called
for at this stage of the proceedings

2. The Deputy Commissioner
is requested to intimate when
the heirs of the deceased Lakshmi
Nenamappa actually file
a suit regd their claims
in a Court of Law.

2. The Dy Comr has now to take action under para 2 of the Govt Pro (Mizrai) No. 3542 dated 26th March 1905.

By order,

27/7/07

Secretary

26/7/07

Draft for approval

Muz. 14]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

Dated

Despatched 31.7.07

Received

General No 647
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No.

Correspondence ending with his letter No. 40, dated 19th July 1907, reporting that Lakshmi Narainappa, who gave the notice regarding this claim to the main land endowed to the Sri Kailasaseswaraswamy temple at Honnavalli in the Tiptur Taluk is now dead and that it is not known whether

CPS—3,000—21-7-06